A Counter to a Reply to a Comment
Author(s): Milton Jacobs
Source: *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 67, No. 2 (Apr., 1965), pp. 502-503
Published by: Wiley on behalf of the American Anthropological Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/668274
Accessed: 10/06/2014 18:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wiley and *American Anthropological Association* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Anthropologist.*

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.112 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 18:22:50 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

or institutions interested in the I.A.A. and wishing to buy the first set, do also wish to subscribe to the complete series to be published at irregular intervals from now on.

JACQUES NENQUIN
Musée royal de l'Afrique centrale
Tervuren, Belgium

A COUNTER TO A REPLY TO A COMMENT

Hopefully, this short communication will end an interesting encounter (with Alex Weingrod) about Moroccan Jewry in Morocco and Israel.

In his Brief Communication (1964:66), Weingrod lightly dismisses my concern with "factual questions" and then embarks upon a theoretical argument. I also have a deep interest in theory but without devaluating the importance of objective and accurate observation reporting and analysis. It seems quite clear to most of my colleagues that anthropological theory must be tested with all the "facts" (data) available. Or have we reached the point where theories are used to test theories? It also occurs to me that anthropologists have always held fieldwork in high esteem. The intersecting of Weingrod's study of Moroccan Jewry in Israel and mine in Morocco I see as positive and constructive; my comments—designed to qualify and elaborate—have been made in that light.

First, to examine the factual disagreements:

1. *Property:* Now by comparing Weingrod's original statements (1962:116) my comments (1964:124, 125) and his replies (1964:634) to my comments that pertain to the question of property rights to Moroccan Jewry, it becomes clear that (1) I added depth to Weingrod's shallow statement and (2) I emphasized the "land and house" aspects of property because these are more critical discriminators between superordinates and subordinates than the ownership of baubles.
2. *Class and Origins of Oren Villagers:* I almost hesitate to comment on this area of our dialogue. Nowhere in his original statement does Weingrod mention that the Oren villagers had come from villages in Morocco (1962:121). "Modest means" is a most ambiguous descriptor. Suddenly in Weingrod's reply to my comments (1964:126) such terms as "villages, rural, and lower-class" appear (1964:634). The author is more exact in battle than in research.
3. *The Eminent Religious Specialist and Rabbi in Oren:* Again, Weingrod is more exact in his reply (1964:634) to my comment (1964:126) than in his original article (1962:121, 125, 126). Had I known that he spoke of the beadle and not the priest, I would have remained silent. But to me a rabbi is a rabbi unless he is a shochet (ritual slaughterer).

In view of the discussion above, I have no choice but to make this comment: in each disagreement between my comments and Weingrod's state-

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.112 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 18:22:50 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

ments in his original article, he has shifted ground (between his original statements and his replies) to substantiate his original positions.

The theoretical argument can be handled quickly. Nowhere do I claim that external accommodation leads only to continuity. In a culture contact context, accommodation is fine evidence that change is threatening or already exists. Obviously accommodation means change but change following a pattern that has some survival value. Accommodation is functional in the sense that it softens the blows and abruptness of change. It thus allows for the pull and tug of the two systems in contact without completely destroying the cohesiveness and equilibrium of the subordinate system. If this means that accommodation leads to continuity, so be it. Few culture change experiences in my recollection have followed the all or none formula that I somehow read in Weingrod's "theoretical" arguments.

MILTON JACOBS
The American University
Field Office-Panama

REFERENCES CITED

JACOBS, MILTON
1964 Some comments on Weingrod's article on reciprocal change. American Anthropologist 66:124–127.

WEINGROD, ALEX
1962 Reciprocal change: A case study of a Moroccan immigrant village in Israel. American Anthropologist 64:115–131.
1964 On interpreting change: A reply to Milton Jacobs. American Anthropologist 66:633–637.

CROW TERMINOLOGICAL SCALES: CORRECTIONS

There are a number of errors in the Crow scales which were recently published in this journal (Buchler 1964:768, 770). Professor Eggan (1964) has pointed out that the documentary evidence from Edwards (Eggan 1937) would make the *minus* in Table I, variables two and three, and in Table II, variables eight and nine, *plus* for Choctaw. I gave historical breakdown products from Morgan and Swanton (FZDD≠FZ and FZDS≠F). Further, Tlingit should be coded *plus* for variable four and minus for variable five; with the same rank order of equations. The corrected coefficient of reproducibility for Scale I is therefore 1.00.

For Scale II, the following scale types are in error:

Incorrect scale types		*Corrected scale types*	
1. Siriono	7	1. Kaska	6
2. Kaska	7	2. Haida	6
3. Haida	7	3. Siriono	7
7. Tlingit	11	7. Tlingit	10
8. Natchez	11	8. Natchez	10

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.112 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 18:22:50 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions